

**A. Smith
10/828,579**

**Response to Office Action and Request for Reconsideration
Page 15**

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are pending in this application. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for finding patentable subject matter in Claims 23-31. In the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 19, and 32-35, and objected to Claims 6, 10, 14-18, and 20-22.

By this paper Applicants amended the specification to correct typographical errors. In addition replacement drawings accompany this response.

Drawings

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings stating that Figures 7 and 8 were mislabeled. In the accompanying replacement drawings, Applicant has relabeled Figure 7 to Figure 8, and relabeled Figure 8 to Figure 7, as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Specification

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because of informalities. The Examiner stated that on page 17, line 12 "aperture stop" should be assigned the reference letters AS, not AG, and several of the equations were not sequential. Applicants have made the changes suggested by the Examiner, as well as correcting references within the text to reflect the new, corrected, equation reference numbering.

Claim Objections

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 18. By this paper Applicants have canceled Claim 18 thereby making the objection moot.

Claim Rejections

In paragraphs 4-11, The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 7-8, 11-13, 19, and 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and Claims 3-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). By this paper Applicants have canceled Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 19, and 32-35, thereby making the rejection moot.

**A. Smith
10/828,579**

**Response to Office Action and Request for Reconsideration
Page 16**

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 6, 10, 14-17, and 20-22 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this paper Applicants have amended Claims 6, 10, 14, 15, and 20-22 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that as amended Claims 6, 10, 14, 15, and 20-22 are in condition for allowance. In addition, Claims 16 and 17 depended from Claim 15 which is now in condition for allowance, thus Claim 16 and 17 are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims, in the application, Claims 6, 10, 14-17, 20-31 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and further examination of the application are requested. A Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Heller Ehrman LLP

By:



Alan C. Gordon
Registration No. 51,220

Attorney Docket No.: 38203-6294

Address all correspondence to:

David A. Hall
HELLER EHRMAN LLP
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92122-1246
Telephone: (858) 450-8400 Facsimile: (858) 450-8499
Email: david.hall@hellerehrman.com

SD 790411 v1
(38203.6294)